



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a gentleman, McClellan was General Michie's ideal. But notwithstanding his unquestioned and versatile abilities, the volume writes him down as a failure in the effective management of a great army in the face of the enemy.

H. V. BOYNTON.

Reconstruction in Mississippi. By JAMES WILFORD GARNER. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xiii, 422).

The Reconstruction of Georgia. By EDWIN C. WOOLLEY, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.] (New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. 112).

MR. WOOLLEY, so I understand, is a Northern man, Mr. Garner a Southerner. So much might perhaps be inferred from a comparison of their treatises, but to make the inference one must begin by conceding to both writers the purpose to be fair. Mr. Woolley avoids the risk of being unfair by declining to attempt any close study of Southern conditions and Southern character, but criticises freely the motives of the Northern leaders in Reconstruction and the policy they adopted. Mr. Garner is extremely shy of criticising the acts of Congress, and does not generalize about the policy, but his perfect familiarity with the people and the conditions in Mississippi is manifest. Each shows by his restraints his fear of being partial. So far as impartiality is honesty, neither leaves anything to be desired.

The merit of Mr. Woolley's essay is in making clear the legal and constitutional uncertainties, the two-sided questions, which successively arose to justify in some measure the curiously illogical steps by which Georgia was brought haltingly back into the Union—from which, according to the only constitutional theory which is consistent with the measures that had been taken to preserve it, she never had actually withdrawn herself at all. The author starts with the proposition that congressional Reconstruction was constitutional if we consider it an exercise of the war powers of Congress. After that, nothing is left to do but to interpret the Reconstruction Acts and reconcile them among themselves. He is logical in his contention that the question whether the ratification of the fifteenth amendment by Georgia validated the amendment itself has nothing to do with the right of Congress to require ratification, or anything else it chose, of the Georgia legislature. Without accepting the argument from war powers, one may concede that it is the best defense of the Reconstruction Acts against the charge of unconstitutionality.

On other grounds, Mr. Woolley criticises the whole plan unsparingly. Neither the humanitarian, the disciplinary, nor the political objects of it—so he classifies the motives of its promoters—were attained. As to the process in Georgia, he outlines it very barely, and concludes that the Reconstruction government of that particular state, though guilty of extravagance, of mismanaging the state railroad, and of pardoning too many criminals, was guiltless of the enormities it has been charged with

Mr. Garner, if he himself does not criticise and generalize, certainly supplies his readers with the amplest material to form their own opinions. If anything that ought to go into his narrative is omitted, it is something that was done at Washington, not in Mississippi: he does not detail the laws of Congress or state fully President Johnson's original proposals. Every step of the two processes in Mississippi is set forth with transparent honesty, every condition and element of the problem there is adequately considered. Going back to the beginning of the secession movement, and making a résumé of Mississippi's experience in the war, he prepares us, as we could not otherwise be prepared, to understand how the impoverished, disappointed people were affected by the changes they were hurled through. For thoroughness, straightforwardness, completeness, the work deserves high praise; it is no doubt the best account we have of Reconstruction anywhere. It is so good a piece of work that one is vexed, as one often is with similar performances, not to find it better—not to find it of such a quality, and so rounded out into a book, that no phrase like "a piece of work" would fit it. That, however, is what it is. Mr. Garner writes acceptably, because he writes honestly and simply, though not always correctly, but he writes without art, and our interest in the profoundly human story he is telling is never heightened by any device of his. Now and then we glimpse a humorous aspect of the matter, but he does not seem to enjoy it with us. One is led to think of his book, and his solid, plodding style, as a result of Reconstruction. Surely no Southerner of an earlier generation could have recounted so dispassionately these humiliations of his people or so carefully have weighed out praise and blame to such a man as Adelbert Ames, military governor, United States Senator and finally civil governor of a state which he never saw until he marched into it as a conqueror and which he left forever so soon as a legislature bent on impeaching him had agreed to let him resign.

Mississippi is perhaps the best state to single out for a fair example of carpet-bag rule. It was not misruled so atrociously as South Carolina, nor, on the other hand, did the native whites regain control so quickly as in Georgia. Mr. Garner goes far enough in the way of generalizing to tell us that the Mississippi carpet-baggers were probably superior as a group to those of South Carolina and Louisiana. The blacks of the state outnumbered the whites, however, and they were mostly of the densely ignorant, large-plantation type. Here are a few of the more striking instances Mr. Garner mentions of the upside-down arrangement which Reconstruction for a time established.

Every member of the Madison county board of supervisors, an important legislative body, was a negro, and only one member could sign his name; there was not a justice of the peace in the county who could write. The negro president of the Wilkinson county board testified before a committee of Congress that his property consisted of "a mule, a horse, two cows, and a family." Amite's board was made up of four negroes and one white man, all under indictment. Yazoo, a very

wealthy county, had a negro sheriff, a negro chancery clerk, circuit clerk, two negroes in the legislature, and three on the board of supervisors. The chancery clerk said he "could write a little." One member of the board was a native white. All the other county officers were carpet-baggers—the assessor from Iowa, the circuit judge from Pennsylvania, the chancellor from New Hampshire. The salaries of most local offices had been raised to very handsome figures. Some of the sheriffs got from fifteen to twenty thousand a year. Crosby, the negro sheriff of Warren county, the forcible ejection of whom from office was the main provocation to the Vicksburg rioters of 1874, could not write a return, and the signatures on his bond were all made with marks except one, and that was a married woman's, whose signature did not bind her.

W. G. BROWN.

Asia and Europe. Studies presenting the conclusions formed by the author in a long life devoted to the subject of the relations between Asia and Europe. By MEREDITH TOWNSEND. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1901. Pp. xii, 388.)

As the subtitle of this book indicates the author has given long and close attention to the fascinating subject of the relations between Orient and Occident, which his life-work for a time afforded him the opportunity of studying at first-hand. In the presentation of his views, Mr. Townsend rarely leaves the sound basis of personal observation or historical experience, and even in the few instances where he allows himself to indulge in forecasts, he simply draws the logical conclusions of facts and conditions which he has found to exist. As few writers have the experience and insight necessary for the discussion of so broad and far-reaching a subject, the views of a man who has enjoyed such opportunities will claim wide attention, although they cannot of course be assured of universal assent. While Mr. Townsend is not an historian, inasmuch as he does not present any sequence of events but rather discusses and illustrates tendencies, still his work is of importance to the historical student as a commentary on the political, social, and philosophical movements in the orient, and especially in India, during the last half century. The author does not go into any detailed critical or technical discussion of actual systems of government, or of administrative measures, his point of view being neither political nor economic, but psychological; in the irreconcilable characteristics of the general mental constitution of the eastern and western races, which he attempts to analyse, he sees an insurmountable barrier which no assimilating efforts can level to the ground. As the book is composed of a series of contributions to English reviews, covering a period of several decades, the character of its contents is somewhat fragmentary, and the reader must gather from various parts the author's opinion on any given topic. Often we would gladly know without having to consult Poole's *Index* at what time the various essays were written, in order to avoid the feeling of encountering anach-